REMARKS

The present response is to the Office Action mailed in the above-referenced case on August 29, 2006, non-final. Claims 1-41 are standing for examination. Claims 1-5, 12-16, and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunn et al., US 5999612, hereinafter Dunn, in view of Has et al., US 6230137, hereinafter Has, and further in view of Vander Molen, US 4520576, hereinafter Vander Molen. Claims 6-11 and 30-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunn, in view of Has, further in view of Vander Molen, and further in view of Kurganov et al. US 6721705, hereinafter Kurganov. Claims 17-26 and 33-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunn, in view of Has, further in view of Vander Molen, and further in view of Ball et al. US 6600736, hereinafter Ball.

Applicant has carefully studied the art presented and relied upon by the Examiner, and the Examiner's rejection and statements of the instant Office Action. In response, applicant herein amends the claims to remove unnecessary language for the sake of clarification, although the claims are not amended particularly to overcome the art. Applicant believes the rejection to be in error, and that the art cited and combined does not teach all of the limitations of applicant's invention as claimed, evidenced by the arguments presented below.

The Examiner admits that Dunn does not explicitly teach; "a plurality of speech engines that recognize speech and synthesize speech to allow the speech-based conversations to occur over the first connection port and the second connection port." The Examiner relies upon Has to teach applicant's said limitation referencing portions col.2, line 10 - col.4, line 67 of Has' disclosure.

Applicant argues that the Examiner provides 3 full columns of Has to evidence

the teaching of a plurality of speech engines that recognize speech and synthesize speech to allow the speech-based conversations to occur over the first connection port and the second connection port. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner be more specific when citing references as surely there is an element for element equivalent if Has, as espoused by the Examiner, actually teaches a plurality of speech engines, as claimed. Applicant finds absolutely no reference to a plurality of speech engines in the art of Has, as alleged by the Examiner.

Applicant argues that devices 1-3 of Has, as relied upon by the Examiner are not speech engines, as taught and claimed in applicant's invention. Speech engines, as taught and claimed are for receiving and recognizing speech and words of a user. Device 1, element 3, of Has is clearly taught as a microphone for receiving speech signals (col. 5, lines 27-30). The second and third devices are integrated through device 4, which is a controller for processing the signals inputted from the microphone (device 1). Any speech engine in Has is in the connected computer, and is taught as one engine, not a plurality.

The teaching of Has' devices surely cannot read on applicant's claimed plurality of speech engines that recognize speech and synthesize speech to allow the speech-based conversations to occur over the first connection port and the second connection port. Applicant points out the benefit and necessity of needing a plurality of speech engines to accommodate incoming speech on a plurality of networks. The art of Has simply fails to teach applicant's claimed speech engines.

Therefore, applicant believes claims 1 and 27 are clearly patentable over the art provided by the Examiner. Dependent claims 2-26 and 28-42 are patentable on their own merits, or at least as depended from patentable claim.

It is therefore respectfully requested that this application be reconsidered, the claims be allowed, and that this case be passed quickly to issue. If there are any time extensions

needed beyond any extension specifically requested with this amendment, such extension of time is hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with this amendment, authorization is given to deduct such fees from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully submitted,
Stuart Berkowitz et al.

By *|Donald R. Boys|*
Donald R. Boys
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency, Inc.
3 Hangar Way, Suite D
Watsonville, CA 95076

TIME : 11/28/2006 22:23

DATE,TIME	11/28 22:19
FAX NO./NAME	USPTO
DURATION	00:03:57
PAGE(S)	14
RESULT	OK
MODE	STANDARD
	ECM